

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,820		09/20/2001	David Thomas Davies		1047
20462	7590	04/10/2003			
SMITHKL	INE BE	ECHAM CORPOR	EXAMINER		
P.O.BOX 1	539	LLECTUAL PROPE	WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E		
KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-0939				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1614	1/
				DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003	$\mathcal{U}$

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



# Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/889,820

Applicant(s)

Davies et al.

Examiner

Kevin E. Weddington

Art Unit 1614



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears o	n the cover	sheet with	the corresp ndence address		
	for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the						
mailing - If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any re	glate of this communication.  Deriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply an to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	e statutory minim nd will expire SIX e application to b	oum of thirty (3 (6) MONTHS (6) ecome ABAND	(0) days will be considered timely.  from the mailing date of this communication.  ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Dec 2, 200</u>	02		•		
2a) 🗌	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This action	on is non-fir	nal.			
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance exclosed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex par</i>					
Disposit	tion of Claims					
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-13</u>			is/are pending in the application.		
4	a) Of the above, claim(s) 2-11 and 13			is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) 🗆	Claim(s)			is/are allowed.		
6) 💢	Claim(s) 1 and 12			is/are rejected.		
7) 🗆	Claim(s)					
8) 🗆	Claims	6	are subject	t to restriction and/or election requirement.		
	ntion Papers					
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) 🗆 accep	oted or b)	$\square$ objected to by the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the dr	awing(s) be	held in abe	eyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on		is: a)□	approved b) $\square$ disapproved by the Examiner.		
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to	o this Office	action.			
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	ner.				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13)💢	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pri	iority under	35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) 🕽	☑ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:					
	1. $\[ egin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	e been rece	ived.			
	2. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been rece	ived in Ap	plication No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do application from the International Bures	au (PCT Rule	e 17.2(a)).			
_	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the		·			
14)[]	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic			• •		
a) ∟ 15) □	The translation of the foreign language provisional Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic					
		priority drid	er 55 0.5	.c. 33 120 dild/ol 121.		
Attachm	nerrit(s) otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	v Summary (PT	O-413) Paper No(s)		
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	_	•	nt Application (PTO-152)		
	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6	6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1614

CLAIMS 1-13 ARE PRESENTED FOR EXAMINATION.

APPLICANTS' PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT AND INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FILED SEPTEMBER 20, 2001 HAVE BEEN RECEIVED AND ENTERED.

APPLICANTS' ELECTION FILED DECEMBER 2, 2002 IN RESPONSE TO THE RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT OF OCTOBER 29, 2002 HAS BEEN RECEIVED AND ENTERED.

THE APPLICANTS ELECTED THE INVENTION DESCRIBED IN CLAIMS I AND I 2 (GROUP I) WITH TRAVERSE, ALONG WITH ELECTED SPECIES, [3R,4R]-I-HEPTYL-3-(CARBOXYMETHYL)-4-[3-(6-METHYOXYQUINOLIN-4-YL)PROPYL]PIPERIDINE.

APPLICANTS' TRAVERSE OF THE RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT IS NOT FOUND

PERSUASIVE SINCE THE REJOINING OF THE TWO OTHER INVENTIONS WITH THE ELECTED

INVENTION WOULD BE AN UNDUE BURDEN ON THE EXAMINER. FURTHER, EACH INVENTION

IS CAPABLE OF SUPPORTING ITS OWN PATENT.

CLAIMS 2-11 AND 13 ARE WITHDRAWN FROM CONSIDERATION AS BEING DRAWN TO THE NON-ELECTED INVENTION (37 CFR 1.142(B)).

#### PRIORITY

RECEIPT IS ACKNOWLEDGED OF PAPERS SUBMITTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. I 19(A)-(D), WHICH PAPERS HAVE BEEN PLACED OF RECORD IN THE FILE.

Art Unit: 1614

### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

APPLICANTS' ELECTED SPECIES IS DEEMED ALLOWABLE BY THE EXAMINER.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102

THE FOLLOWING IS A QUOTATION OF THE APPROPRIATE PARAGRAPHS OF 35

U.S.C. I O2 THAT FORM THE BASIS FOR THE REJECTIONS UNDER THIS SECTION MADE IN

THIS OFFICE ACTION:

A PERSON SHALL BE ENTITLED TO A PATENT UNLESS -

(A) THE INVENTION WAS KNOWN OR USED BY OTHERS IN THIS COUNTRY, OR PATENTED OR DESCRIBED IN A PRINTED PUBLICATION IN THIS OR A FOREIGN COUNTRY, BEFORE THE INVENTION THEREOF BY THE APPLICANT FOR A PATENT.

CLAIM 12 IS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(A) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY FRANCE PATENT (L), HEREBY KNOWN AS RENAULT ET AL.

RENAULT ET AL. TEACH PIPERIDINE DERIVATIVES AND THEIR THERAPEUTIC USES (SEE THE ENCLOSED ABSTRACT). NOTE ONE OF THE PIPERIDINE DERIVATIVES, THE R GROUP IS 4-QUINAZOLINYL, WHICH INCLUDES ONE OF THE APPLICANTS' COMPOUNDS, 1-[2-(1,1-dimentylethyl)-4-QUINAZOLINYL]-3-(4-PIPERIDINYL)-1-PROPANONE, AND IS FORMULATED INTO COMPOSITIONS. CLEARLY, THE CITED REFERENCE ANTICIPATES THE APPLICANTS' INSTANT COMPOSITION COMPRISING THE SAME COMPOUND. CLEARLY THE CITED REFERENCE TEACHES THE APPLICANTS' INSTANT COMPOSITION IS OLD AND WELL-KNOWN IN THE ART, THEREFORE, THE INSTANT COMPOSITION IS UNPATENTABLE.

CLAIM 12 IS NOT ALLOWED.

Art Unit: 1614

## CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

THE FOLLOWING IS A QUOTATION OF 35 U.S.C. I O3(A) WHICH FORMS THE BASIS FOR ALL OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS SET FORTH IN THIS OFFICE ACTION:

THIS APPLICATION CURRENTLY NAMES JOINT INVENTORS. IN CONSIDERING

(A) A PATENT MAY NOT BE OBTAINED THOUGH THE INVENTION IS NOT IDENTICALLY DISCLOSED OR DESCRIBED AS SET FORTH IN SECTION I O2 OF THIS TITLE, IF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SUBJECT MATTER SOUGHT TO BE PATENTED AND THE PRIOR ART ARE SUCH THAT THE SUBJECT MATTER AS A WHOLE WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS AT THE TIME THE INVENTION WAS MADE TO A PERSON HAVING ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART TO WHICH SAID SUBJECT MATTER PERTAINS. PATENTABILITY SHALL NOT BE NEGATIVED BY THE MANNER IN WHICH THE INVENTION WAS MADE.

PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A), THE EXAMINER PRESUMES THAT THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE VARIOUS CLAIMS WAS COMMONLY OWNED AT THE TIME ANY INVENTIONS COVERED THEREIN WERE MADE ABSENT ANY EVIDENCE TO THE CONTRARY.

APPLICANT IS ADVISED OF THE OBLIGATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.56 TO POINT OUT THE INVENTOR AND INVENTION DATES OF EACH CLAIM THAT WAS NOT COMMONLY OWNED AT THE TIME A LATER INVENTION WAS MADE IN ORDER FOR THE EXAMINER TO CONSIDER THE APPLICABILITY OF 35 U.S.C. 103© AND POTENTIAL 35 U.S.C. 102(E), (F) OR (G) PRIOR ART UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A).

CLAIM I IS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. IO3(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER RENAULT ET AL. (L).

RENAULT ET AL. WAS DISCUSSED ABOVE <u>SUPRA</u> FOR USE OF THE INSTANT PIPERIDINYLQUINOLINE COMPOUNDS IN PHARMACEUTICAL COMPOSITIONS.

Art Unit: 1614

THE INSTANT INVENTION DIFFERS FROM THE CITED REFERENCE IN THAT THE CITED REFERENCE DOES NOT TEACH THE INSTANT PIPERIDINE DERIVATIVES ARE USED TO TREAT BACTERIAL INFECTIONS. HOWEVER, ONE SKILLED IN THE ART WOULD HAVE ASSUME THE INSTANT PIPERIDINE DERIVATIVES WOULD EFFECTIVE AGAINST BACTERIAL INFECTIONS SINCE THE DERIVATIVES OR COMPOUNDS POSSES THERAPEUTIC USES. CLEARLY, THE USE FOR TREATING BACTERIAL INFECTIONS IS A THERAPEUTIC FUNCTION, THEREFORE, THE USE OF THE INSTANT COMPOUNDS TO TREAT BACTERIAL INFECTION IS OBVIOUS IN THE ABSENCE OF EVIDENCE TO THE CONTRARY.

CLAIM I IS NOT ALLOWED.

ANY INQUIRY CONCERNING THIS COMMUNICATION OR EARLIER COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE EXAMINER SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO EXAMINER K. WEDDINGTON WHOSE TELEPHONE NUMBER IS (703) 308-1235.

(evin E. Weddingsor Primary Examiner Art Unit 1614

K. WEDDINGTON

APRIL 6, 2003